

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record

## BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,462	03/22/2000	Oak Abhijit	30566.94US01	7780

22462 7590 10/06/2004

GATES & COOPER LLP  
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER  
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/532,462	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ABHIJIT, OAK	
	<b>Examiner</b> James H Blackwell	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/08/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4-5, 11, 14-15, 21, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schreiber et al. (hereinafter Schreiber, U.S. Patent No. 6,298,446).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 11, and 21), Schreiber teaches displaying an image to a user in a web page (a web page here contains an instance of the object, an image in this case that is modified) without downloading unmodified image data to the user's computer (Col. 3, lines 10-14). In place of the original image, substitute data, such as encrypted image data, is sent to the browser when the original image is protected (the original image remains on the server, while the altered instance goes to the client). Compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 11, and 21), “... ***(a) storing the object data for the object separate from a file containing an instance of the object***”). Schreiber also teaches that at step 202 (see Fig. 2), the client computer requests a connection to the server computer (compare with *(b) obtaining a request to load the file*) (Col. 11, lines 18-19). At step 210 the web server receives the HTTP request for the web page from the client computer. At step

212 the server computer searches a database to determine whether or not the web page being requested references any protected images, or has protection tags ((c) *determining if the object data is available*). If so (object data not available), it routes the incoming HTTP request to an HTTP request filter (see Fig. 1). The HTTP filter applies a web page parser to the requested web page and identifies the images referenced there within. At step 214 the server computer generates a modified web page wherein references to the protected images are replaced with references to substitute data. The substitute data is preferably derived from the protected images (Col. 11, lines 25-38). The modified web page is preferably a separate web page generated by a web page modifier, so that the original web page is preserved, as indicated in Fig. 1. Alternatively, the substitute references may be incorporated directly into the original web page, without generation of a separate modified web page. At step 216 the modified web page is sent back to the client computer within an HTTP response. At step 218 the client computer receives the modified web page containing references to substitute data, and the web browser begins to render the modified web page. In rendering the modified web page, the web browser encounters the references to the substitute data, and at step 220 the substitute data processor within the client computer issues to the web server an HTTP request for the substitute data. At step 222 the server computer receives the HTTP request for the substitute data, and at step 224 the server sends an HTTP response containing the substitute data to the client computer. At step 226 the client computer receives the HTTP response containing the requested substitute data, and at step 228 the client computer processes the substitute data using a substitute

data processor, as described hereinabove with respect to Fig. 1, and renders the web page (Col. 11, lines 42-64). If the server computer determines at step 212 that the requested web page does not reference protected images and does not have protection tags, then the HTTP request is passed to the server without any parsing ((*d*) if the object data is available). In this case, the processing is much simpler, and proceeds in the normal manner. Specifically, a modified web page is not generated and substitute data is not used. Rather, at step 232 the unmodified web page is sent to the client computer within an HTTP response. At step 234 the client computer receives the HTTP response containing the unmodified web page, and the web browser begins to render the web page. In rendering the web page, the web browser encounters the references to unprotected images, and at step 236 the client computer issues an HTTP request for the unprotected images to the web server (*obtaining the object data*). At step 238 the server computer receives the HTTP request for the unprotected images, and, in response, at step 240 the server computer sends an HTTP response containing the unprotected images. At step 242 the client computer receives the HTTP response with the unprotected image data, and at step 244 the web browser processes the unprotected images and renders them with the web page (Col. 12, lines 3-23; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 11, and 21), “... **utilizing the object data to display a graphical representation of the object**”).

In regard to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly dependent Claims 14, and 24), Schreiber teaches that it is requesting a web page containing references to images (commonly, the references are in the form of URLs) (Col. 3, lines 8-14; compare with

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 4 (and similarly Claims 14, and 24), “... ***storing a reference to the object data in the file***”) and Claim 5 (and similarly Claims 15, and 25), “... ***the reference is a uniform resource locator***”).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 6-10, 12, 16-20, 22, and 26-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber.

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly dependent Claims 12, and 22), Schreiber teaches that if the requested image is protected, then substitute data, preferably derived from the protected image, is sent instead (the original object data can be sent in an encrypted form) (Col. 11, lines 28-47; compare with Claim 2 (and similarly Claims 12, and 22), “... ***displaying an empty graphical representation if the object data is not available***”. Schreiber does not specifically teach that an empty graphical representation is displayed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have treated Schreiber's substitute data as having provided a similar function to the empty graphical representation in that both would have acted as placeholders for the original data until such time that the original data were available, thereby providing the benefit of preventing unauthorized access to protected images.



In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly dependent Claims 16, and 26), Schreiber teaches a management tool for managing protection of digital images residing on a server computer. The management tool preferably enables an administrator to select specific images to be protected from unauthorized copying or use as described hereinabove (Col. 8, lines 32-35; compare with Claim 6 (and similarly Claims 16, and 26), “... **the object data is stored on a secure server**”). Schreiber does not explicitly teach that the server is a secure one. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that the protected images are secure on the web server, providing the benefit of protection from unauthorized use. Schreiber also teaches that at step 212, the server computer searches a database to determine whether or not the web page being requested references any protected images, or has protection tags (Col. 11, lines 28-31; compare with Claim 6 (and similarly Claims 16, and 26), “... **the determining if the object data is available further comprises determining if the request to load the file provides proper access permissions for the object data**”).

In regard to dependent Claim 7 (and similarly dependent Claims 17, and 27), Schreiber teaches that in Fig. 1, a server computer 100 typically includes web server software 102 that serves web pages 104 to a plurality of client computers 106 over the Internet. Web pages 104 typically contain references to images that are to be embedded within the pages when the pages are rendered on client computers 106. The images referenced in web pages 104 typically reside on server computer 100, although they may reside on other computers as well (Col. 9, lines 18-29; compare with Claim 7

(and similarly Claims 17, and 27), “... ***the request to load the file originates from outside a network where the object data is stored***”). Schreiber also teaches that at step 212 the server computer searches a database to determine whether or not the web page being requested references any protected images, or has protection tags. If so, it routes the incoming HTTP request to an HTTP request filter, as described hereinabove with respect to Fig. 1. The HTTP filter applies a web page parser to the requested web page and identifies the images referenced there within. At step 214 the server computer generates a modified web page wherein references to the protected images are replaced with references to substitute data (Col. 11, lines 28-38; compare with Claim 7 (and similarly Claims 17, and 27), “... ***the object data is not available because a network security mechanism determines that the request does not provide the proper access permissions***”).

In regard to dependent Claim 8 (and similarly dependent Claims 18, and 28), Schreiber teaches that in Fig. 1, a server computer 100 typically includes web server software 102 that serves web pages 104 to a plurality of client computers 106 over the Internet. Web pages 104 typically contain references to images that are to be embedded within the pages when the pages are rendered on client computers 106. The images referenced in web pages 104 typically reside on server computer 100, although they may reside on other computers as well (Col. 9, lines 18-29; compare with Claim 8 (and similarly Claims 18, and 28), “... ***the separate location is on a supplier’s network***”). Schreiber also teaches (in Fig. 4) that at step 402 the user launches a protection manager software tool. At step 404 the protection manager computer initiates

connection to a web server on the server computer (Col. 13, lines 45-47). Furthermore, at step 416 the protection manager computer displays this information within a user interface of the protection manager tool. At step 418 the user selects one or more folders and/or web pages, from among a list of folder names and web page file names displayed by the user interface (Col. 13, lines 63-67). Also, at step 430 the user selects one or more folders, web pages and/or images from the list of folder names, web page file names and image file names displayed by the user interface, and sets their protection status to protected or unprotected (Col. 14, lines 23-27). After editing the protection status of various folders, web pages and images, the user clicks on a "submit" button to apply the new protection settings (Col. 14, lines 33-35; compare with Claim 8 (and similarly Claims 18, and 28), **"... a supplier maintains and updates the object data"**). Schreiber does not specifically teach a supplier. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to recognize that supplier's can have networked servers whose data are maintainable and updateable, providing the benefit of access to the latest information for consumers.

In regard to dependent Claim 9 (and similarly dependent Claims 19, and 29), Schreiber teaches that the client computer 106 displays an image accessed over the Internet using a web browser. The image may be an unprotected image 702 or substitute data for a protected image 704 (Col. 18, lines 51-55; compare with Claim 9 (and similarly Claims 19, and 29), **"... the utilizing the object data occurs in real time across a network"**). Schreiber does not explicitly state that access occurs in real time, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

assume that the image would have been rendered soon after it was accessed over the Internet, providing the benefit of timely access to data.

In regard to dependent Claim 10 (and similarly dependent Claims 20, and 30), Schreiber teaches that in place of the original image, substitute data, such as encrypted image data, is sent to the browser when the original image is protected (the original image remains on the server, while the altered instance goes to the client) (Col. 3, lines 8-14). Here, the file is a web page containing an instance of an image (substitute data). Schreiber does not explicitly teach that *the file is a drawing*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that the file containing the instance of the image could be that of a drawing. Schreiber also teaches that a modified version of the real image (object) can be an encrypted form of the original (Col. 3, lines 26-30; compare with Claim 10 (and similarly Claims 20, and 30), “... **the object is a drawing component**”). Schreiber also implies that the encrypted object, once decrypted, would contain object data that could be rendered by the browser (compare with Claim 10 (and similarly Claims 20, and 30)), “... **The object data provides the graphical representation of the drawing component**”).

In regard to dependent Claim 31 (and similarly dependent Claims 33, and 35), Schreiber teaches that the watermarked image is transmitted in a standard image format, such as JPEG and GIF, and, as such, it can be displayed by the web browser (Col. 25, lines 1-2; compare with Claim 31 (and similarly Claims 33, and 35), “... **the object data comprises content for a document**”). Schreiber does not explicitly disclose that the object data comprises content. However, it is well known that image

Art Unit: 2176

formats such as those disclosed by Schreiber (JPEG, and GIF) contain content (the image data) as well as formatting information (color information, size, etc.). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that JPEG and GIF images contain content (image data) providing the benefit of a standard format enabling a web browser to render an image to a viewer.

In regard to dependent Claim 32 (and similarly dependent Claims 34, and 36), Schreiber teaches that the watermarked image is transmitted in a standard image format, such as JPEG and GIF, and, as such, it can be displayed by the web browser (Col. 25, lines 1-2; compare with Claim 32 (and similarly Claims 34, and 36), “... ***the object data comprises formatting information for displaying the object***”).

Schreiber does not explicitly disclose that the object data comprises formatting information. However, it is well known that image formats such as those disclosed by Schreiber (JPEG, and GIF) contain content (the image data) as well as formatting information (color information, size, etc.). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that JPEG and GIF images contain formatting information providing the benefit of a standard format enabling a web browser to properly render an image to a viewer.

Claims 3, 13, and 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Sonderegger (U.S. Patent No. 5,893,118).

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly dependent Claims 13, and 23), Schreiber does not teach *storing a universally unique identifier (UUID) with the file to match the object and the object data*. However, Sonderegger teaches (in Fig. 2), a network configuration in which a network client 20 acts as a Java client 40. That is, some piece of Java-aware software running on the client 40 has identified a particular Java software component whose methods may be investigated and possibly used. Java-aware software includes Web browsers that contain a Java interpreter, stand-alone Java interpreters, and other software capable of browsing, gathering, and/or interpreting Java code in its various forms. The desired software component is typically identified by one or more of the following: a Java class name, a Java package name, a Universal Resource Locator ("URL"), a server identifier, a volume identifier, and a file path. However, the desired software component may also be identified by a globally unique identifier ("GUID"), a universally unique identifier ("UUID"), or by other means (Col. 7, lines 20-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Schreiber and Sonderegger because both deal with requesting and obtaining objects over a network. The benefit provided by adding Sonderegger would have been to provide an unambiguous way to distinguish one object from another.


**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell  
10/01/04

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER